

(SRI K. PATTABIRAMAN)

If you say that the Government need not have placed this budget before this House and at the same time say that we are asked to vote on the Appropriation Bill that follows as a result of the budget, I would like to know what is the position.

Sri K. F. PATIL (Ranibennur).—What would have been the position of this House had the budget been thrown out? That will have to be considered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nothing would have happened. Government's position, technically would have remained unaffected. The Governor has authorised the expenditure. I find that there are many acts which are not prohibited by the Constitution. This is such an act and I think it was proper for the Government to do it and they have done it. I have gone into this matter deeply since it is an act which is not covered by the Constitution. I came to the conclusion that the budget should be placed before the House and that only discussion should take place on it and nothing more.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—How can we transact any business that is not covered by the Constitution?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not against the Constitution. The Hon'ble Member I am afraid, has not been, following the discussion properly. This question has been discussed and a ruling has been given by me on this point.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—May I know whether the withdrawals will be under this Appropriation Bill or under the powers which will be made under the States Reorganisation Act?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The appropriation would be made under the authority of the Government. I would rather agree with the Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Iyenger when he said that all this was redundant. I agree to that extent. But sometimes we have to be necessarily redundant.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Then should we not treat this as a serious business?

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is also a serious business. To discuss the budget is not a simple thing.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (Sreerangapatna).—ಮೂರು ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಂದ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಈಗ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೊಳೆದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Only one point I have to say because my friend Sri Kolkebail unfortunately happened to make a remark against the officers drawn from different areas. There was an implied motive. I want to refute statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the Bill to the House. The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be considered.”

*The motion was adopted.*

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, is considered. The Bill will be read clause by clause. As there are no amendments I will put all these clauses to vote.

The question is :

“That Clauses 2, 3 and 1, the Schedule the title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

*The motion was adopted.*

Clauses 2, 3 and 1, the Schedule and the title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

*Motion to pass*

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be passed.”

*The motion was adopted.*

### **MYSORE LEGISLATURE (PROHIBITION OF SIMULTANEOUS MEMBERSHIP) BILL, 1956.**

*Motion to consider.*

\*Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I move

“That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed

by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Sir, Article 119 of the Constitution requires that provision be made by an Act of the State Legislature concerned for prohibiting simultaneous membership of both Houses of Legislature in those States where the Legislature consists of two Houses. Previously in the State of Mysore, Act 33 of 1951 made this provision. That Act is no longer applicable to the new Legislature of the new State of Mysore and accordingly this Bill has been brought forward. The Bill makes provision for two cases. The first is, where a member seeks election to the Legislative Assembly of the State as well as the Legislative Council of the State and has not taken his seat in either House, he has to elect which seat he will retain. The other case for which provision is made is, where a member who is already a member of one of the Houses and seeks election to the other House his seat in the other House will be deemed to have been vacated. To this end, this legal provision has been made. I commend the Bill for the acceptance of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the Bill would be read clause by clause. As there are no amendments I will put clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4, the title and preamble to the House.

The question is :

"That clauses 2, 3, 4 and 1, and the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clauses 2, 3, 4 and 1 and the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

*Motion to pass.*

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I move :

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Question is :

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill is passed.

### HYDERABAD AGRICULTURAL DEBTORS RELIEF (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

5-30 P.M.

\*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Minister for Co-operation) :—Sir, I beg to move.

"That the Hyderabad Agricultural Debtors Relief (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

In this connection, I would like to submit a few words for the consideration of the House. This Bill was passed by the Hyderabad Legislature and came into force on 5-10-1956. Under sub-section (1) of Section IV the creditors and debtors were given an opportunity to file their applications before courts within three months from the date. But unfortunately that Government did not take action to frame rules and bye-laws that had to be framed thereunder. The Act having been brought into force, there were no rules and bye-laws. Nor did the assent of the President for the Act was obtained. It therefore necessitated this Government to bring this measure to regularise the Act and also take power to frame rules and bye-laws. Hence the amendment to the section.

In the original sub-section, there was a provision to make necessary applications within three months from the